

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action for the above-identified application mailed November 4, 2003.

In the Office Action, it was stated that the claims submitted in the Amendment filed August 14, 2003 was non-responsive.

In a telephone interview with the Examiner on November 18, 2003, it was acknowledged that Claims 32-41 are claims that are responsive to the outstanding amendment and that they would be examined. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of willingness to review these claims.

Under cover of this Response, minor editorial changes were made to Claim 32. This change does not modify the definition of the screening device to which this claim is directed.

Claims 42-61 have now been cancelled. No new claims are added.

It is submitted that this application is now in condition in which it substantive review should continue.

It is submitted that, for the reasons set forth in the amendment filed August 14, 2003, Claims 32 and the companion dependent claims are directed to an invention that is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Goldenberg
David S. Goldenberg

DSG\pcq

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C. 2026 Rambling Road Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1631 Phone: (269) 381-1156 Fax: (269) 381-5465	Dale H. Thiel David G. Boutell Ronald J. Tanis Terryence F. Chapman Mark L. Maki David S. Goldenberg Liane L. Churney Brian R. Tumm Robert J. Sayfie Steven R. Thiel Sidney B. Williams, Jr.	Reg. No. 24 323 Reg. No. 25 072 Reg. No. 22 724 Reg. No. 32 549 Reg. No. 36 589 Reg. No. 31 257 Reg. No. 40 694 Reg. No. 36 328 Reg. No. 37 714 Reg. No. 53 685 Reg. No. 24 949
--	--	---

Encl: Postal Card
136.0703